

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

While the Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's rejections set forth in the Office Action dated December 7, 2007, by way of this response the Applicant has made clarifying amendments to claims 21 and 33 to further distinguish the claimed subject matter from the cited references. No admission or representation is made by the present argument other than that explicitly provided herein.

The Examiner rejected claims 21-24, 29, 30, 33, 38, and 39 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0160817 to Salmimaa et al. ("Salmimaa"). The Examiner further rejected claims 25-28, 31, 32, 34-37, 40, and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Salmimaa in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0248437 to Hellebust et al. ("Hellebust"). The Applicant respectfully submits that the subject matter defined by claims 21 to 41 is both new and non-obvious in view of Salmimaa and/or Hellebust for the reasons set forth below.

The present application is directed to a method and system for providing notifications of new events on a wireless communication device. The method provides notifications of new events on a wireless communication device having a small display. The wireless communication device has a graphical user interface 'GUI' displayed on a display of the wireless device. The GUI has a main screen comprising an application portion for displaying icons for respective applications for execution on the wireless device and a status portion for displaying wireless communication device status information. The method comprises providing on the main screen and in the application portion a plurality of application icons each representing an application for managing respective events on the wireless device and each being invokable to launch its respective application. The application icons occupy a major portion of the main screen. In response to a new event in respect of one of the applications, the respective application icon in the application portion of the main screen is visually modified to notify of the new event. The application icons are maintained on the main screen continuously.

In contrast, Salmimaa concerns modifying icons in a context bar of a mobile terminal (Paragraph 0024). The context bar comprises a plurality of icons displayed along an edge of the display (i.e., a horizontal edge as shown in FIG. 1 or a vertical edge as shown in FIG. 2). The sizes of the icons are modified together in response to context values. The context values relate to variables associated with the icons, such as the prices of services or goods associated with the icons, the distance of the establishments associated with the icons from the location of the mobile terminal, etc. (Paragraph 0029). The arrangement of icons along an edge of the display shown by Salmimaa is done because the mobile terminal of Salmimaa is fundamentally different from the wireless communication device presently claimed.

Salmimaa does not disclose or suggest displaying icons in an application portion of the screen because the screen of Salmimaa is sufficiently large such that the icons are arranged along an edge of the screen. (FIGS. 1, 2, and 3) In this regard, Salmimaa implicitly teaches away from a wireless communication device having a small display, as presently claimed. As such, the mobile terminal of Salmimaa does not present the same technical challenges associated with the claimed wireless communication device of which the claimed subject matter is designed to address. For this reason, Salmimaa fails to teach or suggest many of the features recited in claim 21.

For example, the claimed wireless communication device has a small display. The wireless communication device GUI has a GUI having a main screen comprising an application portion for displaying icons for respective applications for execution on the wireless device and a status portion for displaying wireless communication device status information. Salmimaa does not teach or suggest a wireless communication device having both an application portion for displaying icons and a status portion for displaying wireless communication device status information.

Salmimaa additionally fails to teach or suggest providing on the main screen and in the application portion a plurality of application icons, each being invokable to launch its respective application. The icons of Salmimaa represent information such as a hyperlink or a document. (Paragraph 0038) The icons of Salmimaa do not represent

respective applications and are not invokable to launch their respective applications, as presently claimed. In this regard, Salmimaa again teaches in a direction that is contrary to the claimed subject matter.

The Applicant notes that, in relation to claim 22, the Examiner suggests that the application launcher 410 described by Salmimaa is the same as the claimed application icons that are each invokable to launch their respective applications. However, this configuration is substantially different from the claimed subject matter. Salmimaa explicitly teaches at paragraph 0038 that icons have associated hyperlinks or documents. If the user clicks one of the icons, the application launcher 410 then determines an appropriate application to open the document associated with the icon that the user clicked and the application launcher 410 then launches that application. As such, the icons of Salmimaa are not directly representative of respective applications, as claimed.

Further, the change of size of the icons disclosed by Salmimaa is not in response to a new event in respect of one of the applications, as presently claimed. Since the icons of Salmimaa are not application icons invokable to launch their respective applications, as presently claimed, it follows that the icons of Salmimaa would not change in size in response to new events in respect of those applications. In contrast, Salmimaa discloses changing the size of all of the icons in response to context values, which are related to data gathered by the mobile terminal. (see, for example, paragraph 0026) In this respect, Salmimaa again teaches in a direction that is contrary to the claimed subject matter.

As such, Salmimaa fails to disclose or suggest, in response to a new event in respect of one of the applications, visually modifying the respective application icon in the application portion of the main screen to notify of the new event. Further, the change in size of icons disclosed by Salmimaa presents an indication to a user of a relationship of the context values; it does not notify of a new event in respect of an application, as presently claimed.

Since Salmimaa fails to disclose or suggest many of the features recited in claim 21, claim 21 is patentable over Salmimaa. Claim 33 claims a graphical user interface for

use on a wireless device and recites many of the same features as claim 21 and is patentable for the same reasons. Claims 22-32 and 34-41 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 21 and 33 and are patentable for the same reasons.

The Examiner has the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. However, the Examiner has failed to provide a motivation as to why one skilled in the art would be motivated to modify the teachings of Salmimaa with the teachings of Hellebust. The Examiner's statements of motivation seem to simply parrot the claim language and provide nothing from within the cited references that show why one skilled in the art would be motivated to modify the teachings of Salmimaa with the teachings of Hellebust. As such, the Examiner has failed to provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness and the claims are patentable over Salmimaa and/or Hellebust.

As the Applicant had previously pointed out in the response submitted on August 9, 2007, Hellebust concerns a filtered in-box for voice mail, e-mail, pages, web-based information, and faxes. Hellebust teaches sending an alert message to users of wireless devices if it is determined that the message is of sufficiently high priority. Hellebust does not appear to concern modifying icons in any way and therefore fails to cure the deficiencies of Salmimaa. The teachings of Hellebust are irrelevant to the teachings of Salmimaa, as well as the claimed subject matter. There is no reason why one skilled in the art reviewing the teachings of Salmimaa, which relate to displaying prioritized icons in a mobile terminal, would modify the teachings of Salmimaa with reference to Hellebust, which relates to a filtered inbox for voicemail and email.

It is therefore submitted that the claims are patentable over Salmimaa and/or Hellebust, whether taken alone or in combination.

Favourable reconsideration and allowance of the application are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions in connection with the Applicant's submissions, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

OGILVY RENAULT LLP

Date: January 28, 2008

By /pjf/
Paul J. Field
Registration No. 34,963
Telephone (416) 216-3903
Fax (416) 216-3930

OGILVY RENAULT LLP
Suite 3800, Royal Bank Plaza, South Tower
200 Bay Street, P.O. Box 84
Toronto, Ontario M5J 2Z4
Canada